

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on October 9, 2003 has been received and its contents have been carefully considered.

In the Office Action, Examiner has rejected all of the original claims of the present application on the grounds that the claimed subject matter is either anticipated by Marshall (US Re. 31,477) or is obvious over various combinations of Marshall, Salerno et al. (US Pat. No. 6,558,008) and Ueda et al. (US Pat. No. 5,838,400).

In response to the Office Action, Applicant is amending the claims to more clearly define the features of the present invention that are distinguishable over the cited prior art references. For at least the reasons discussed below, Applicant believes that the claimed invention is patentable over the prior art and that the amended application should be allowed. Further, the Applicant is amending the disclosure on line 13, page 7 of the specification to correct a typographical error. It is respectfully submitted that all of the specification and claim amendments are supported by the original application, and consequently, no new matter has been introduced by the amendments.

In the amended claims, Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 8-9 and 12, and canceled claims 7 and 11. Claims 4-6, 10 and 13-15 remain unchanged. Claims 1-3 remain the independent claims in this application.

The cited Marshall reference discloses a flat cable 10 having signal lines 12 and grounding pieces 11 interlaced with the signal lines.

The cited Salerno reference discloses in col. 1, lines 33-35, a general description of TFT LCDs, and in col. 1, lines 39-50, a description of how a flat panel display employing an LCD works. Particularly, in col. 1, lines 46-48, Salerno discloses that the liquid crystal material will rotate when an electric field is applied across it between the circuit panel and **a ground affixed to a filter plate** (emphasis added). Furthermore, Salerno discloses in FIG. 4A a shielded electronics assembly 865 connected to a display panel 864 through a cable 863.

The cited Ueda reference discloses in col. 11, lines 59-63, a metallic shield casing SHD, and in col. 13, lines 5-7, that a soldering iron can be applied to the metallic shield casing to perform soldering work.

Claim 1 of the present invention is amended to recite a cable including a metallic layer (210) received in the plastic body (250), located beside the signal lines (126) and electrically

connecting with the grounding pieces (220), and a metallic linking piece (204) located outside the plastic body and electrically connecting with the metallic layer, adapted for electrically connecting with a metallic member (e.g., the metallic casing 230). These additional features are not taught or suggested in Marshall. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the applied prior art.

For Salerno, the ground is disclosed as being affixed to a filter plate and provided for rotating the liquid crystal material, rather than for shielding the cable. Furthermore, in FIGS. 4A and 4B of Salerno, only a simple schematic drawing shows that a shielded electronics assembly 865 is connected to a display panel 864 via a cable 863. There is no detailed description in Salerno of how the cable is connected with the shield electronics assembly 865. Thus, even if the cable 863 of Salerno were replaced by the cable 10 of Marshall, the limitations of amended claims 2, namely, that a metallic linking piece is located outside the plastic body, electrically connected with the grounding pieces and adapted for electrically connecting with a grounding terminal, are not disclosed in the alleged combination. Thus, the Applicant believes that amended claim 2 is not obvious over Salerno in view of Marshall, as the Examiner asserts.

Moreover, the added limitations of claim 3, that a metallic layer is received in the plastic body, located beside the signal lines and electrically connecting with the grounding pieces, and that a metallic linking piece has a first portion electrically connecting with the metallic layer and a second portion electrically connecting with the grounding terminal, are not shown in the alleged combination. Thus, the Applicant believes that amended claim 3 is also not obvious over Salerno in view of Marshall. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 2 and 3 are patentable over the applied art references, whether considered individually or in combination.


Finally, since amended claim 3 is not obvious over the combination of Salerno and Marshall, claims 4, 13-15 which are dependent on claim 3, directly or indirectly, also distinguish over the applied art combination. Moreover, claims 5, 6, 8-10 and 12, which are dependent on claim 3, directly or indirectly, are not obvious over Salerno in view of Marshall, and further in view of Ueda, as the Examiner asserts. In particular, the limitation of claim 9 that an anti-oxidized grounding pad is installed on the metallic layer and electrically connects with the metallic linking piece, is not disclosed in any of the cited prior art references. Thus, claim 9 independently distinguishes over the applied prior art.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the amended claims are allowable over the cited references, so that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, notice of allowance and the passing of this case to issue are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

January 8, 2004
Date


Phillip G. Avnuch
Registration No. 46,076
RABIN & BERDO, PC
Customer No. 23995
(202) 371-8976 (Telephone)
(202) 408-0924 (Facsimile)
firm@rabinchamp.com (E-mail)

PGA/rw